

THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR

C. P. No. D – 715 of 2026

[Imam Dino v. Province of Sindh and others]

Before:
Justice Arbab Ali Hakro
Justice Muhammad Osman Ali Hadi

Petitioner by : Mr. Sikandar Sadar Siddiqui, Advocate

Respondents by : Mr. Shahryar Imdad Awan, Assistant Advocate
General Sindh

Date of Hearing : **09.09.2026**

Date of Decision : **09.09.2026**

ORDER

ARBAB ALI HAKRO, J. – The petitioner has invoked the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court, seeking his consideration for appointment under the 5% quota reserved for persons with disabilities.

2. The petitioner claims to be a person with disability, suffering from Polio to the extent of 65%, and possesses a Disability Certificate bearing Registration No. SPDPA/D.A.C-0060/2026, issued on 01.01.2026 by the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, Government of Sindh. He states that he is Intermediate-qualified and a permanent resident of District Sukkur, and that he approached the concerned authorities for appointment against the disability quota. It is further his case that he submitted an application along with his testimonial documents, Domicile and PRC, seeking appointment against a suitable post under the said quota. The said application is available on record.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that, despite the submission of the application and the petitioner's eligibility for consideration under the disability quota, the petitioner was not appointed. He therefore seeks a direction to the respondents to consider his candidature and appoint him to any suitable post in accordance with law.

4. Learned AAG Sindh, while referring to the comments/report submitted by the Deputy Commissioner, Sukkur, submits that the recruitment process under the 5% quota for persons with disabilities was conducted by the District Selection Committee. It is stated that twenty (20) appointments were made at a meeting held in January 2026, at which more than 1000 applicants appeared for interviews. The petitioner also appeared for the interview; however, after considering the eligible candidates, he was not recommended for appointment by the District Selection Committee.

5. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned AAG Sindh, and have perused the averments contained in the petition, the documents on record, and the comments/report submitted by the respondents.

6. The material on record shows that the petitioner participated in the recruitment process conducted by the District Selection Committee. However, despite appearing for the interview, he was not recommended for appointment. The petitioner has not brought on record any material to establish that his candidature was excluded from consideration or that the selection process was conducted in violation of the prescribed procedure.

7. It is an essential requirement for appointment to any government or public post that a candidate must satisfy the prescribed legal and codal requirements and undergo the recruitment process initiated by the competent authority. The mere submission of an application or participation in an interview does not confer an automatic right of appointment upon a candidate. The ultimate selection depends on eligibility, merit and the recommendation of the competent selection authority, subject to the available vacancies.

8. The reservation of quota for persons with disabilities is a statutory safeguard intended to ensure their effective representation in government employment. However, such reservation does not dispense with the prescribed recruitment process or confer an unconditional right of appointment upon every person falling within the said category. The benefit

of the reserved quota is required to be given effect through a fair, transparent and lawful selection process.

9. The Sindh Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2018, being beneficial legislation, provides for a 5% reservation for persons with disabilities in Government departments, institutions and entities. The said provision is required to be implemented in its true spirit; nevertheless, appointments against the reserved quota remain subject to the prescribed eligibility and selection requirements. Thus, while a person with disability is entitled to consideration against the reserved quota, such consideration does not necessarily result in appointment.

10. In the present case, the respondents have specifically stated that the petitioner appeared for the interview conducted by the District Selection Committee but was not recommended for appointment. The available record does not disclose any material suggesting that the petitioner was denied consideration or that the District Selection Committee acted arbitrarily or contrary to the prescribed procedure. Mere possession of a disability certificate and submission of an application, therefore, cannot, by themselves, furnish a lawful basis for directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner.

11. In these circumstances, no direction can be issued for the direct appointment of the petitioner. However, the petitioner shall remain at liberty to participate in any subsequent recruitment process conducted by the competent authority under the 5% quota reserved for persons with disabilities. If eligible, his candidature shall be considered in accordance with the law, merit and the prescribed recruitment procedure.

12. Accordingly, the instant Constitutional Petition is **disposed of** in the above terms.

J U D G E

J U D G E